

REMARKS

The Office Action of November 12, 2009, has been carefully studied. Claims 11, 12 and 14-29 currently appear in this application. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and formal allowance of the claims.

Claims

New claims 14-29 have been submitted. These claims are all directed to a method for producing a multilayered unstretched film from at least a first thermoplastic resin, a second thermoplastic resin, and an edge-forming thermoplastic resin, and for making a metal sheet coated with this unstretched film.

Election/Restriction

Restriction has been required between the following two groups of claims:

Group I, drawn to a process for creating a multilayered unstretched film on a metal sheet, presently comprising claims 14-29; and

Group II, drawn to an apparatus for creating a multilayered unstretched film presently comprising claims 11 and 12.

Applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 14-29.

Claim Objections

Claims 7-9 are objected to.

As the present amendment cancels claims 7-9, this objection is now moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As claim 5 has been cancelled, this rejection is now moot. The new claims recite a shear rate of at most 3000 poise at a 20-500 sec⁻¹ shear rate. Support for this limitation can be found in the specification as filed at page 17, paragraph 0017.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As claims 7-10 have been cancelled, this rejection is now moot. The new claims do not contain the language the Examiner alleged is indefinite.

Art Rejections

Claims 13, 3, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenz, US 4,731,004 in view of Mori, JP 2003-201248, Pfeiffer, US 5,716,570 and Komodo, US 4,476,080.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 13, 3, 4 and 6 have been cancelled, and it is believed that new claims 14-29 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wenz in view of Mori, Pfeiffer and Komodo and further in view of Okazaki, US 5,389,422.

Claim 5 has been cancelled, so this rejection is now moot.

It should be noted that in new claims 22, 23, 26 and 27 the melt viscosity of the thermoplastic resin is lower than the melt viscosity of the edge-forming resin.

Claims 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi, IS 6,645,559 in view of Mori, Wenz, Peifer and Komodo.

Claims 7, 8 and 10 have been cancelled, so this rejection is now moot.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Mori, Wenz, Pfeiffer and Komodo and further in view of Okazaki

Claim 9 has been cancelled. So this rejection is now moot.

Appln. No. 10/591,054
Amd. dated March 12, 2010
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2010

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornbau

Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\O\Ohta\Fujii9\Pto\2010-03-12Amendment.doc